

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 and 18-35 are in the application.

Claims 1, 3, 7, 10, 13, 14, 18, 26, 28, 30 and 33-34 are amended.

The independent claims each recite that the captured image results from data and operation of a computer program; that is, the source image file or object is an incomplete definition of the image. Rather, the captured screen image represents more than the source information. For example, rasterization, GUI elements, cursors, and the like, will be present in a screen image, but not in the image or object data.

This amendment therefore clearly distinguishes image capture, as opposed to screen capture, software.

The screen capture programs are distinguished by virtue of the association of the saved or stored image with text in a "page". It is not believed that any screen capture software prior to the present application supported this feature.

Other amendments to the claims are made principally as a matter of form, and are not intended to alter the rationale for patentability. For example, saved image files are associated with the input text, rather than combined, the later of which is believed to be overly restrictive in view of the broad nature of the invention. For example, in an HTML web page, a URL of an image may be referenced, or in some instances a graphic object explicitly defined in the HTML code.

Claims 1, 13, 26, 30 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Matthews et al. in view of Merritt et al. (US 006031335A).

In accordance with the amendments to claim 1, textual information is received for association with a computer screen image. The program code then automatically captures the display image (which is, prior to that time, not "saved" in an image file format, but rather resident in a screen buffer or cache, and dependent on both the data and the operation of a computer program), and saves it in a predetermined image file format. The saved image file is automatically associated (e.g., a reference to a URL) with the textual input to form a page, and the page is automatically stored in memory. Claim 13 includes a similar method, and claim 30 define a corresponding system.

Claims 26 and 33-34 are distinguished because neither Matthews et al nor Merritt et al. teaches or suggests that input text be associated with a captured screen image (comprising both data and program-dependent elements), as discussed above.

The claims are believed to distinguish the references applied by the Examiner, in that in order to operate the cited prior art to achieve the present result, it would require a series of manual steps, each of which has numerous options, and which potentially leads to a large number of possible results if the process is unguided by use of impermissible hindsight. There is simply no teaching or suggestion in the art to combine the references and select these particular options to achieve the claimed result in an automated fashion, without the exercise of inventive skill.

Therefore, it is believed that the present claims distinguishes the cited prior art, as well as common "print screen" capture programs which were known at the time of the invention, and therefore that the claimed invention is patentable.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven M. Hoffberg
Reg. 33,511

MILDE & HOFFBERG, LLP
10 Bank Street - Suite 460
White Plains, NY 10606
(914) 949-3100